

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-3 and 5-20 are pending. Claims 1, 2, 3, 15, 16, and 18 have been amended. New claim 20 has been added. No claim has been canceled. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-3 and 5-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Claims 1, 15, and 18 have been amended in response to the rejection. Support for "internal bus" in claim 15 is provided in Fig. 2. The specification has been amended to provide support for "a power input..." in claims 15 and 18. The specification has been amended according to original claim 2, as filed.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-10, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Shimotono. Applicants traverse the rejection. The claimed embodiment relates to a monitor system having a second monitor that is coupled to a shared peripheral bus interface. The shared peripheral bus interface provides limited bandwidth for the second monitor since it may be shared by a plurality of peripheral devices. Accordingly, the "first memory," "second memory," and "a video driver" cooperate with each other to minimize the data transfer to the second monitor. That is, the "image data corresponding to said first portion of said image are transmitted to said second monitor and image data corresponding to said second portion of said image are **not** transmitted to said second monitor."

Lee discloses two monitors but neither one of them appears to use a shared peripheral bus interface. These two monitors presumably use dedicated monitor ports so Lee does not disclose or suggest the need to conserve bandwidth in the manner recited.

Although Lee discloses two auxiliary memories, Lee does not disclose a first auxiliary memory that is used to store image information that has been transmitted to the second monitor and a second auxiliary memory that is used to store image information to be transmitted to the second monitor. Nor does Lee disclose a video driver that compares the image information stored in these two memories. This is so, presumably, because Lee does not use a shared peripheral bus interface.

Shimotono does not remedy the above deficiencies of Lee. Claim 1 is allowable at least for this reason. Claims 2-3, 5, 6, and 8-10 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least for this reason.

Claim 18 is directed to an apparatus having a second display screen that is coupled to a remote host via a shared bus interface. As explained above, neither Lee nor Shimotono discloses or suggests such a device. In addition, claim 18 recites a second display screen that automatically displays certain notifications received from the Internet. The cited references do not disclose such a feature. Claim 18 is allowable.

Claims 11-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee and Shimotono further in view of Grossman. Applicants traverse the rejection. These claims depend from claim 1 and is allowable at least for this reason.

Claims 7, 15-17 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(s) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Shimotono and further in view of Craig. Applicants traverse the rejection. Claim 7 depends from claim 1 and is allowable at least for this reason.

Claim 15 is directed to a monitor system having a second monitor coupled to a shared peripheral bus interface. As explained above, neither Lee nor Shimotono disclose these features. Craig does not remedy this deficiency. In addition, claim 15 recites a second monitor that can display automatically a specific type of application. None of the references above disclose this automatic display feature. Claim 15 is allowable. Claims 16 and 17 depend from claim 15 and are allowable at least for this reason.

Claim 19 depends from claim 18 and is allowable at least for this reason.

Applicants respectfully request a telephone interview prior to issuing a next Office Action.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 09/640,168
Amdt. dated April 19, 2004
Reply to Office Action of December 17, 2003

PATENT

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



Steve Y. Cho
Reg. No. 44,612

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
Attachments
SYC:asb
60113259 v1